



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,213	10/28/2003	Kazumori Horikiri	117616	3001
25944 7590 12/04/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HOANG, HIEU T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2452				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,213

Applicant(s)

HORIKIRI ET AL.

Examiner

HIEU T. HOANG

Art Unit

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13 and 44-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13 and 44-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/6/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/29/2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 2, 5, 14-43 are cancelled
3. Claims 44-55 are new.
4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 44-55 are pending.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are unpersuasive. Applicant argues about features when a plurality of conference participants logs into different site systems. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Katz clearly teaches when a plurality of conference participants logs into different site systems ([0006], [0007], members logging in from different site locations, [0045], fig. 22, members from different companies can share files and workspaces), the shared workspace server establishes a session between the different site systems, the different site systems share input/output interfaces with application software by connecting electronic whiteboards of the different site systems to the shared workspace server ([0006]-[0007], [0045], fig. 22, members

from different site locations and companies can share files using a GUI interface or whiteboard containing a task list and file list).

6. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach establishing a session between the different site systems when a plurality of participants log into different site systems. The limitation does not have anything to do with timing of the connections as argued by applicant, rather, it can be read as establishing a session between the site systems that user have logged into. In that sense, Katz does teach establishing a session between the different site systems when a plurality of participants log into different site systems ([0006]-[0007], [0045], fig. 22, members logged into different site locations and companies can be connected to one another to share files using a GUI interface or whiteboard containing a task list and file list)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13, 44-47, 49-51, 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. (US 2003/0014488, hereafter Dalal), in view of Katz et al. (US 2003/0158745, hereafter Katz)

9. For claim 1, Dalal discloses a teleconference system for supporting realization of cooperative work among a plurality of conference systems, the teleconference system comprising:

site systems each being installed at a plurality of sites, each site systems system (fig. 1, clients with client conference controllers) being configured to generate a workspace of an object for managing and using cooperation units corresponding to respective conferences (fig. 2, [0012], conference control components are used by users to perform cooperative work),

and each site system comprising:

all electronic whiteboard configured to provide a graphical user interface provided by a shared workspace (fig. 5, web browser providing a shared workspace, [0097]); and

an authentication unit configured to authenticate identifications of conference participants ([0047], [0036]);

a site server configured to manage a workspace for managing (1) a session in the site systems (fig. 1, client session controller), (2) a file used in a conference and created as a record of the conference ([0036], lines 11-20), (3) reference information to a resource relevant to the conference ([0049], claim 6), and (4) history information of file access made by conference participants ([0036] lines 5-12); and

a shared workspace server configured to manage all the workspaces for managing the sessions, the files, the reference information and the history information, which are generated in the workspaces (fig. 1, conference service provider, fig. 2,

shared workspace among user systems, fig. 2, [0036], conference database record stored at the server/provider),

wherein each site system provides a conference participant with a display of a set of workspaces relevant to the conference participant when the conference participant logs into the site system ([0056-0057], user logs in to his conference),

Dalai does not explicitly disclose:

when a plurality of conference participants logs into one site system, the one site system provides the plurality of conference participants with (i) a display of a set of workspaces relevant to the plurality of conference participants and (ii) a display of reference information managed of a workspace selected by the plurality of conference participants,

when a plurality of conference participants logs into different site systems, the shared workspace server establishes a session between the different site systems, the different site systems share input/output interfaces with application software by connecting electronic whiteboards of the different site systems to the shared workspace server, and

as a response to a file reference request from one of the different site systems, the shared workspace server starts the application software to reference a file specified in the file reference request, and to provide the input/output interfaces with the application software to the different site systems with the session established.

However, Katz discloses:

when a plurality of conference participants logs into one site system, the one site system provides the plurality of conference participants with (i) a display of a set of workspaces relevant to the plurality of conference participants and (ii) a display of reference information managed of a workspace selected by the plurality of conference participants (fig. 20, 21, users Peter and Katherine of a same company sharing the workspaces by accessing Thermal regulating coating Project directory or Project 1, reference information is comments in chat window),

when a plurality of conference participants logs into different site systems ([0006], [0007], members logging in from different site locations, [0045], fig. 22, different company members can share files and workspaces), the shared workspace server establishes a session between the different site systems, the different site systems share input/output interfaces with application software by connecting electronic whiteboards of the different site systems to the shared workspace server ([0006]-[0007], [0045], fig. 22, members logged into different site locations and companies can be connected to one another to share files using a GUI interface or whiteboard containing a task list and file list), and

as a response to a file reference request from one of the different site systems, the shared workspace server starts the application software to reference a file specified in the file reference request, and to provide the input/output interfaces with the application software to the different site systems with the session established (fig. 22, [0063-0064], opening or viewing or saving a shared file/document).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dalal and Katz to share workspace or project directories in the conference system of Dalal to allow users of Dalal share project files, schedule and communicate to team members (Katz, abstract).

10. For claim 3, Dalal-Katz further discloses the shared workspace server is further configured to provide a user interface for connecting a session and making reference to a file or a resource (Dalal, fig. 5, web browser, [0097]).

11. For claim 4, Dalal-Katz further discloses the shared workspace server is further configured to instruct, when a client starts a session, all other clients already having started the session to connect to the client (Dalal, [0043], [0058]).

12. For claim 6, Dalal-Katz further discloses the shared workspace server is further configured to select a workspace based on user identification information transmitted from the site system (Dalal, [0030]).

13. For claim 8, Dalal-Katz further discloses the shared workspace server is further configured to select a workspace based on workspace specification information transmitted from the site system (Dalal, [0036] lines 5-9).

14. For claim 10 and 12, the claims are rejected as in claim 1.

15. For claim 11, Dalal-Katz further discloses the shared workspace server is further configured to, in a case where the file specified in the file reference request is not previously registered in the workspace, temporarily register the file specified in the file reference request (Dalal, [0057] lines 1-6, [0058] lines 1-6).

16. For claim 13, Dalal-Katz further discloses the site system is further configured to receive the file specified in the file reference request from any other site system to start the application software to reference the file specified in the file reference request, and to provide an input/output interface with the application software for any other site system with a session established (Dalal, [0046] lines 10-18, [0036], [0096]).

17. Claims 44-47, 49-51, 53-54 are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13 respectively.

18. Claim 55 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 1.

19. Claims 7, 9, 48, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal-Katz, in view of Kisliakov (US 2005/0178833).

20. For claims 7 and 9, Dalal-Katz discloses the shared workspace server is configured to select the workspace based on the user identification information or

workspace identification information transmitted by the site system. Dalal-Katz does not explicitly disclose that the identification information is transmitted using an IC card.

However, Kisliakov discloses using an IC card to store session and user identification information (see, e.g., [0227]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dalal-Katz and Kisliakov in order to store ID information in a smart card therefore provide ease of ID information storage and retrieval with increased security protection (Kisliakov, [0002]).

21. Claims 48, 50 are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 7 and 9.

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HH/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/THU NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2452